

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMUSEION

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL **CHAIRMAN**

JIM IRVIN

COMMISSIONER MARC SPITZER

COMMISSIONER

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

SEP 2 4 2002

DOCKETED BY

2002 SEP 24 P 12: 47

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKET NO. E-01032C-00-0751

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE ARIZONA ELECTRIC DIVISION OF CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY TO CHANGE THE PURCHASED **POWER** AND **CURRENT** ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE RATE, TO ESTABLISH A AND **PURCHASED POWER** NEW BANK. **AND CLAUSE ADJUSTMENT** REQUEST APPROVED GUIDELINES FOR THE OF **COSTS INCURRED** IN RECOVERY **ENERGY RISK** CONNECTION WITH MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES.

MOTION TO AMEND PROCEDURAL DATES AND **CONTINUE HEARING**

On September 28, 2000, the Arizona Electric Division of Citizens Communications Company ("Citizens") filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") an application to change the current purchased power and fuel adjustment clause rate ("PPFAC"), to establish a new PPFAC bank, and to begin accruing carrying charges and to request approved guidelines for the recovery of costs incurred in connection with energy risk management initiatives.

The hearing in this case was previously scheduled to begin on March 25, 2002. The hearing was delayed in order to resolve issues surrounding Citizens' counsel in this proceeding. (See, April 18, 2002 Procedural Order; July 16, 2002 Procedural Order; and August 23, 2002 Amended Procedural Order).

As a result of both the delay and the nature of the disputes regarding Citizens' counsel, it became obvious that additional discovery and Supplemental testimony would be necessary to complete the record in this proceeding. Based on Citizens' representations, Staff anticipated that the additional discovery would yield a relatively small number of documents. On August 26, 2002, a telephonic Procedural Conference was held to discuss dates for the proceeding. A Procedural Order was issued on August 27, 2002, describing a series of dates for discovery and establishing dates for

27 28 supplemental testimony and the hearing. The Procedural Order directed the Parties to make good faith efforts to follow the procedural schedule, while noting that the dates may be modified for good cause shown upon filing of an appropriate Motion.

Unfortunately, the discovery effort has not proceeded as anticipated, and Staff is forced to submit this Motion seeking amendment to the Procedural Order. There have been two primary causes for the failure of the schedule. The major cause is the fact that, contrary to expectations, a significant amount of information had not previously been provided. Citizens' Response to the First Set of Supplemental Data Requests submitted on behalf of Mohave and Santa Cruz Counties ("Counties") comprised some four boxes of documents. Staff's best estimate is that this response included approximately 13,000 documents. Many of those documents are relevant to the issues in this proceeding. In addition, a number of documents responsive to that Set of Data Requests, as well as certain data requests submitted by Intervenor Marshall Magruder, were not submitted as a result of confidentiality claims asserted by Citizens on behalf of Arizona Public Service Company ("APS"). Finally, there are a large number of documents that Citizens claims to be too voluminous to produce. Citizens' estimates have been as high as 90,000 documents.

These two factors have impacted Staff's ability to achieve the proposed procedural dates in a variety of ways. First, Staff had anticipated being able to complete review of documents and formulation of a second set of data requests within a week. Instead, the review process was extended, and the first Staff questions generated by these documents were not completed until September 20, 2002. Of course, the magnitude and relevance of the documents resulted in a greater than initially anticipated number of data requests being issued in the next set by Staff (Staff's Fifteenth Set of Data Requests). Staff anticipates that it will need to make data requests beyond the Fifteenth set because of the volume and scope of documents only recently disclosed and the new issues those documents raise. Staff also anticipates the need to follow up on responses by Citizens to the Fifteenth Set of Data Requests. The need for future data requests beyond the Fifteenth set was not anticipated prior to now because Staff did not anticipate, nor was there any indication of the sheer volume of documents yet to be disclosed by Citizens. In addition, Staff anticipates the need for future discovery regarding documents not disclosed to this point because of confidentiality claims by Citizens and/or

APS. And, of course, having not received the documents claimed to be confidential due to APS confidentiality claims, Staff anticipates the likelihood of some follow-up discovery on those documents.

In addition to the volume of discovery, these recent disclosures (and continued nondisclosures) by Citizens bring forth new questions and issues pertinent to this case. Staff believes these issues must now be addressed in supplemental testimony. Accordingly, the resultant testimony is likely to be more lengthy and detailed than previously anticipated.

Based on these unanticipated results, Staff now believes the agreed-upon schedule was unrealistic. Assuming that complete responses to all outstanding data requests are provided by September 30, 2002, Staff would be able to commit to submission of our Supplemental Testimony on November 12, 2002. However, since it is not clear when responses will be received to the latest Magruder data requests, or the extent of follow-up necessary from the responses to Staff's Fifteenth Set of Data Requests, this is only a tentative proposal. We would suggest an additional Procedural Conference to establish new dates for Citizens' Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony and a Hearing.

Staff respectfully requests that the Administrative law Judge issue an Order vacating the Procedural Dates established by the August 27, 2002 Procedural Order and convening a Procedural Conference to establish new dates.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 24th day of September, 2002.

Christopher C. Kempley, Chief Counsel

Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission

1200 West Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Jason Gellman, Attorney

(602) 542-3402

28

2	The original and ten copies of the foregoing filed this 24 th day of September, 2002, with:
3	Docket Control
4	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007
5	
6	COPIES of the foregoing were mailed/ hand-delivered this 24 th day of September,
7	2002 to:
8	Robert J. Metli Cheifetz & Iannitelli, P.C.
9	3238 North 16 th Street Phoenix, AZ 85016
10	Attorneys for Citizens Communications Company
11	Daniel W. Pozefsky
12	RUCO 2828 N. Central Ave., Suite 1200
13	Phoenix, Arizona 85004
14	John White
15	Christine L. Nelson Deputy County Attorney
16	P.O. Box 7000 Kingman, Arizona 86402
17	Walter W. Meek
18	AUIA
19	2100 N. Central Ave., Suite 210 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
20	Holly J. Hawn
21	Santa Cruz Deputy County Attorney 2150 N. Congress Drive, Ste. 201
22	Nogales, AZ 85621
23	Raymond S. Heyman
24	Michael W. Patten ROSHKA HEYMAN & DeWULF
25	400 East Van Buren Street, Ste. 800 Phoenix, AZ 85004
26	Attorneys for Mohave and Santa Cruz Counties
27	

28

- 1	Marshall Magruder
2	Lucy Magruder P. O. Box 1267
3	Tubac, AZ 85646-1267
4	Jose L. Machado 777 North Grand Avenue Nogales, AZ 85621 Attorney for City of Nogales, AZ
5	
6	
7	L. Russell Mitten
8	Citizens Communications Company 3 High Ridge Park
9	Stamford, CT 06905
10	John D. Draghi
11	Huber, Lawrence & Abell 605 Third Avenue New York, NY 10158
12	
13	Ernest G. Johnson, Director
14	Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
15	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007
16	Lyn Farmer, Director
17	Hearing Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
18	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007
19	
20	\sim
21	Manay Koe
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	